

ELL Network 2011-2012

Agenda & Minutes



For more information and materials, please visit www.esu6ell.wikispaces.com !

The ELL Network is a forum for district personnel responsible for ELL programs and instruction to discuss pertinent issues, share and explore resources, and network with colleagues. These sessions are the primary means of sharing information throughout the ESU 6 Title III Consortium. We welcome all districts and personnel regardless of consortia affiliation.

April 24, 2012

10:00 am - 2:00 pm
HyVee (84th & Holdrege) Lincoln, NE

Attendees

Jen Madison, Ann, Annette, Marta, Sherry, Darlene, Julia, Ruth, Katie, Jen, Angie, Joy, Kyla, Lisa, Peter, Jenny, Connie, Ann, Mark, John, Salome', Terri, Deb, Janet, Veronica, Ashleigh

Agenda & Notes

Welcome, Introductions

This Google doc agenda will also serve as our collaborative note taking space. Please help record ideas, information, and questions in a professional manner. After the meeting, Jen will finalize this document including our meeting's notes and post them as a PDF on the ELL Network wikispace: <http://www.esu6ell.wikispaces.com> .

Review of 2011-2012 Notes: *Jen has updated some of the meeting notes with recently acquired information. You'll see these notes in red font or side margin comments.*

NDE Update (Terri Schuester)

NDE Updates

The ELDA window closed recently. Rosters are being reviewed by districts now.

NSSRS Coding: Remember to be as accurate and timely as possible with NSSRS data. If students qualify to exit the program, then the student must be coded as Not LEP and then as Redesignated 2 years or less.

Rule 15: [Current Draft](#)

Terri reviewed the important topics from Rule 15. She provided some scenarios to help clarify exit requirements.

- Districts are not required to complete a program review for the 2011-12 school year since the Rule has not yet been signed by the governor. Most likely, this will be required beginning in 2012-13.
- For Exiting Determination: School policy must NOT require proficiency on BOTH the ELDA and NeSA-R. The rule clearly states that one OR the other is sufficient for exiting. Terri explained that according to the rule, schools can determine status on an *individual student basis*. For example, if a student meets the standard according to the NeSA-R, the district may determine and document that the score is not truly representative of the student's language ability. In this case, the district may use the ELDA for the determination (and vice versa). Exit and 2 Year Monitoring - If a student meets exit criteria, the student should be monitored for at least two years. The district should provide supports that would

be provided to all other students as necessary. If a team should decide that the student does, in fact, need further language acquisition support. If this is truly the case, then it would be possible to reinstate the student according to district policy. Retesting (language proficiency, i.e., IPT or LAS) may not be necessary, but would likely provide useful information.

- Arrival from another NE District - If the student arrives from another NE district, the receiving district may choose to retest the student or provide services based upon previous placement and verification from the sending NE district.
- Programs: The Rule 15 Implementation Guide will provide some descriptions for language programs. ESL Pull-Out / Push-In is a newer term which is a combination of program types based largely on information from this resource: Excerpt from Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. *Biennial Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Title III State Formula Grant Program, School Years 2004–06*. Washington, DC; 2008. Pp. 17–18. Available online at http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/3/Biennial_Report_0406.pdf. Many consortium schools would fit this combined model.

Implementation Guide preview

- The guide will be shared and distributed as soon as possible once the Rule goes into effect. NDE is planning sessions for the 2012 Administrator Days, and of course, Deb and Jen will share resources as soon as possible.
- The appendices contain valuable information and tools such as Common Terms and Acronyms, Tool and Templates, NDE Resources, Implementation Checklists, Rule 15, FAQ's.
- Terri "walked" the group through the Draft - Implementation Guide, sharing the structure, implications and best practices.

Program Review: Since a significant provision of Rule 15 is the annual program review, Jen will work with NDE to plan and facilitate a program review opportunity for the fall (after the release of NeSA data).

- The Implementation Guide is likely to have a sample template for this review.
- Terri shared that part of the review is indication of program goals. She clarified that this will likely be specific to the district and should be based on program development, implementation, and achievement data.

Instructional Study / Instructional Round (Video)

Jen led the group through an extended study of structured discussions.

1. Participants were briefly introduced to the [3 Levels of Text Discussion Protocol](#).
2. Participants were asked to read as much of the provided text as possible (during lunch) and identify passages with implications for their work:
3. Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Rothenberg, C. (2008). *Content-area conversations: How to plan discussion-based lessons for diverse language learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. (excerpt from Chapter 5 pp. 93-107)
4. Groups of three or four used the [3 Levels of Text Discussion Protocol](#) to identify and discuss implications for their work.
5. Jen asked each participant to share a word or phrase to encapsulate the most significant implication for their work using the Whip Around or Pass structure.
6. Participants then watched a brief (2 minute) video clip of a teacher in an ELL classroom (Twiest - Popcorn) using strategies similar to those in the text. While watching, they were asked to consider affirmations (positive teaching behaviors that support their work), questions, and at least on application (strategy, idea, adaptation for own classroom practice).
7. Participants assembled into their groups of three to discuss affirmations and questions, and special emphasis was placed on sharing applications.
8. After highlighting several applications in a whole group discussion, Jen again asked each participant to share a significant phrase regarding their intended application.
9. Finally, participants were asked to comment on the way participants were asked to consider, study, and apply the ELL strategies. Several people commented that the use of the video reflection augmented their understanding of the strategies, and they found that the structured

discussions kept them focused.

Discussion Topics

ELL Guidelines: http://www.education.ne.gov/natlorigin/Limited_English_Guidelines.html This is an essential resource for aligning curricula and programs for ELLs!

Code of Ethics for Interpreters (Jen, Title III directors discussion)

At a recent Title III Consortia Leaders meeting, a sample "Code of Ethics" for translators and interpreters was shared. This document can be accessed at <http://esu6ell.wikispaces.com/Resources#x-Shared Documents>.

Family Nights: Who has them? What activities are used? Who is in charge? (Nebraska City)

Crete does two elementary activity nights each year (including preschool and Blue River-migrant) with the purpose of inviting families into the school community. They have used several themes for these nights (e.g., reading theme--library card, games, etc.) They work to include information about community services, educational norms, etc. The all-district event focuses more on orientation to the school (teachers introduce themselves and what they teach, admin there to introduce themselves, school processes introduced, after-school program, school contacts and expectations, etc.). Also commonly used interpreters are there to introduce themselves so families see people who might be of use to them in the community.

Ruth (Norris) makes home visits to the extent possible in order to complete school paperwork and to build relationships.

At one time, Waverly had a monthly session in the evening for parents for relationship building, school processes, and some basic language instruction.

Legal obligations regarding immigration status

What is our legal (not moral) obligation about our student's immigration status? For example, if a student would disclose that they are undocumented, I would assume that this is fine and we are not under any obligation to report that information. But, what if they tell us about a friend/relative who is borrowing someone else's documentation to travel, are we obligated to report that?

Plyler v. Doe (1982). See www.education.ne.gov/Migrant/Documents/The%20Plyler%20Ruling.pdf:

"School systems are not agents for enforcing immigration law and therefore are forbidden to make public any information about the legal status of their students, or to inform other agencies about such status." (www.maec.org/legal.html)

Terri suggested a helpful document from NEA: ["Legal Issues for School Districts Related to the Education of Undocumented Students"](#)

Parent Notification Letters: How are schools explaining services?

Jen suggested that districts model their letter from the one provided on TransAct since it includes the information required by law. To access the letter with references to various sections of Title III law, see "Title III Parent Notification Letter Marked with Law" at the [ESU 13 ELL page](#).

2012-13 Needs:

Professional Development

- Shelly Terrell, May 29, 9-3pm

Our learners enjoy listening to stories and creating stories. Storytelling encourages learners to use the language they have learned and apply it to a context and setting in a creative way. Collaborative digital storytelling takes this learning to the next level. Various online tools and ICTs (information and communication technologies) allow learners to collaboratively create and share their stories digitally. In this plenary, participants will create their own collaborative stories and discover cool digital storytelling tools and lesson ideas. They will leave with practical tips for managing, evaluating, and implementing collaborative digital storytelling projects.

Several people at the session were interested; however, only a few people at the meeting were available on May 29 to attend. Jen will consider our best options.

- Other Professional Development Needs Being Considered:

Data Retreat using ELDA and other data sources (will likely occur fall 2012)

Introduction to NE ELL Guidelines and the alignment NE LA, (in the near future: MATH & SCIENCE)

Using QAR codes in the classroom

- Please let your consortium leader (Jen or Deb) know of the needs in your district!

Resources

- Imagine Learning English
Malcolm & Nebraska City: Perhaps David City- ESU 7 Others interested?
- Rosetta Stone
Please let Jen or Deb know if students no longer need this tool or if you anticipate greater need for 2012-13.

This is a simple form that your district can use to communicate needs to Jen: [Needs Survey](#)

Apps for ELLs: *Please be ready to briefly share the apps you use.*

Popplet (Julia Lonn)

Resource Sharing

[Word Generation](#): This is an academic vocabulary system designed for middle school aged students. It is based on weekly passages with target words from the Academic Word List and includes applications to science, math, social studies, and language arts. It is free to download!

DOVE - Daily Oral Vocabulary Exercises

Words for Academic Writing

Academic Vocabulary for English Learners

DISE - Direct Instruction Spoken English - 4th grade and above, works with MS students, challenges them; some HS students respond well, too

ESU 6 Consortium Districts

requisition funds soon if possible

[End-of-Session Survey](#)

Upcoming PD Opportunities

See <http://esu6ell.wikispaces.com> for details and registration information!

- Shelly Sanchez-Terrell, summer 2012

Questions for Further Consideration & Research

-

Notes for Next Meeting

-
-

February 8, 2012

10:00 am - 2:00 pm

Keene Memorial Library, Fremont, NE

Attendees

Jen Madison (ESU 6), Ashleigh Lange (NCPS), Marta Calhoun (NCPS), Jenny Piening (Malcolm), Julia Lonn (Norris), Ruth Merrett (Norris), Salome' Ausin-Dodge (Beatrice), Janet Burger (Wilber-Clatonia), Marta Calhoun (Nebraska City), Betty Diaz (Crete), Veronica Ortiz (Wilber-Clatonia), Sherry Runnels (Nebraska City), Joy Scheele (Crete)

Several members of the ESU 7 Title III LEP Consortium joined us for this session. They represented districts including Schyler, David City, Logan View, Columbus Lakeview, Emerson Hubbard, and West Point.

Agenda & Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Overview (Deb Wragge)

Rule 15 Study

Deb provided a brief overview of the history and development of Rule 15 which is currently awaiting the Attorney General's signature

We do expect an implementation guide from NDE by the fall of 2012. This document will provide clarification and details that will provide guidance to carry out Rule 15. (The Implementation Guide itself will not carry the force of law.)

(002) Deb clarified the LEP definition, and reviewed the importance of having the appropriate three questions of the home language survey, and then if necessary, using an appropriate language proficiency assessment (e.g., IPT, LAS, Woodcock-Munoz)

Parent Notification

One significant question involved the requirements for the notification of parents. The following is the language of Title III law (from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg50.html>). Jen reminded the group that upon student enrollment at the beginning of year, districts have 30 days to notify parents; during the year, districts have two weeks following enrollment to notify parents. Jen will find out if "30 days" means calendar days or school days.

Follow-Up Note: "...in terms of 30 days for parental notification, the law is not specific as to whether they are calendar days or school days and there is nothing in the definitions section of ESEA (NCLB) that defines it. The director of Federal Programs for NDE says a district can use either calendar or school days; but should be consistent in their interpretation and implementation." (email to Jen from Nancy Rowch, 2.14.12)

Extensive discussion ensued throughout our study of Rule 15. Generalizable pieces of that discussion are summarized in the remaining notes.

What programs are available for newcomers?

Jen and Deb referenced the Nebraska K-12 Guidelines for English Language Proficiency available on NDE's website: http://www.education.ne.gov/natlorigin/Limited_English_Guidelines.html.

Throughout the day's discussion, several specific programs, curricula, and resources were mentioned by group members:

DISE (Direct Instruction Spoken English)

Intensive English

Language for Learning

Espanol to English

Imagine Learning English

Rosetta Stone (Deb shared the Rosetta Stone Teacher's Guide and Student Workbooks. They are available at <http://sites.esu7.org/esu7title/title-iii-ellimmigrant/>.)

Access (Science, History, English, Math)

Larry Bell's 12 Powerful Words

Vocabulary Through Morphemes (Susan Ebberts)

AWL (Academic Word List; Coxhead, 2000)

- AWL Highlighters (e.g., <http://awl.londongt.org/> and <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~alzsh3/acvocab/awlhhighlighter.htm>)

Staffing

Deb explained the need for teachers who are responsible for ELL language instruction to receive professional development.

Jen emphasized that paras--by existing law--should not be responsible for teaching duties, and she shared some thoughts she shared with her by Nancy Rowch. Essentially, budget and resources would not be adequate defense for using paras in teaching capacity in an OCR investigation/audit. (OCR-Office of Civil Rights)

Exit Requirements

The group had strong concerns about 007.01C that Jen will share with Nancy. Primarily, the concern dealt with the fact that the NeSA-R is limited to reading and does not address the other language components (i.e., writing, speaking, listening). The group wants clarification about how much leeway a district has if a student meets/exceeds NeSA-R, but earns a "3" on the ELDA. Jen had a note in her documents from a conversation w/ Terri and Nancy saying "If a student meets on the NeSA-R, but does not earn a 4 or 5, then district could determine not to exit based on other pertinent information." Could the NeSA-W be an appropriate example of that other pertinent information?

Follow-Up Note: **an excerpt from an email to Jen from Nancy Rowch (2.14.12) follows**

"You're correct that a student may be exited if the student scores at the proficient level (4 or 5) on ELDA OR scores at "meeting the standard" on NeSA-R. Perhaps a couple of scenarios might be helpful as districts make sense of the exit criteria in the rule.

Scenario 1: A student scores level 4 on ELDA and does not meet the standard on NeSA-R. The district staff looks at the scores and decides that the student is not quite ready to exit the ELL program and keeps them in for the year. At the end of the next year, the student still scores a level 4 on ELDA and still does not meet the standard on NeSA-R. This time, district staff feels that the student has made a lot of progress over the year and is ready to exit the ESL program.

Scenario 2: A student scores level 3 on ELDA but meets the standard on NeSA-R. The classroom teachers report that this student does well enough in the classroom; even though some scaffolding is still required. They decide to exit the student based on classroom performance.

Scenario 3: A student does NOT score at level 4 or 5 on ELDA and meets the standard on NeSA-R. The district staff feels that the student did not put much effort into ELDA because this student no longer receives direct ESL services and was angry to be pulled out of the content classes in order to take ELDA. They decide to exit the student based on the NeSA scores.

Some of the more current research discusses the question of what is proficient in English and what does a student need to know in order to be exited from a program. The research states that Federal law says that the student must have the "ability" to be proficient in academic content in order to be considered English proficient. One simple approach that's recommended is to identify the English language proficiency level where over half of the English learners score proficient on state content assessments. At that language proficiency level, most English learners should also be successful on state content assessments.

Keeping that in mind, Terri and I ran the data on the 2010-11 data for both ELDA and NeSA-R. We discovered the following:

- Students scoring at Level 4 on ELDA—60% met the standard for NeSA-R
- Students scoring at Level 5 on ELDA – 84% met NeSA-R

Based on the recommendations by the research outlined above, over half of the ELL students score proficient on NeSA-R when scoring at Level 4 on ELDA."

Monitoring

As far as we know, there is no prescribed form(s) for monitoring students. Julia Lonn shared a link to a sample she found online: <http://www.iu1.org/esl/files/forms/postExitELLMonitoringMiddleSecondary.pdf>

Parent/Family Involvement

Nebraska City (Sherry & Ashleigh) is planning an opportunity for high school ELL students to research their heritage and set up booths at Parent Teacher Conferences.

Rule 15 Evaluation

A significant component of Rule 15 is the requirement for evaluation and reporting. Deb and Jen explained that districts must have a yearly report on file regarding the achievement/effectiveness of the ELL program. There is a statewide conversation about creating an evaluation tool or process to guide districts, especially if the implementation guide is not sufficiently specific.

This report must be on file and available upon request; however, board action is unnecessary.

One participant advocated for everyone to be vocal with our stakeholders, leaders, and general public about the difficulties of meeting state and federal accountability with students who are fit into several subgroups (i.e., LEP, poverty, SPED). For example, data shows nearly a 1:1 correlation between students identified as free and reduced lunch and not-met on the NeSA tests; however, many stakeholders may not be aware of this data and its real challenges.

Deb provided a hard copy of the Title III Guidelines as presented within the Grant Management System and explained that consortia leaders submit the application in line with these guidelines.

Deb directed the group to read a research summary and complete a graphic organizer pointing out three key ideas and three classroom implications which the group discussed.

Nagy, W. & Townsend, D. (Jan-Mar 2012). "Words as Tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47:1, 91-108. Available 8 February 2012 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/RRQ.011/pdf>.

The session adjourned at 2:00 pm.
